ORIGINAL

EX PARTE OR LATE FLED AND WALSH, L. L. P.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

A PARTNERSHIP INCLUDING A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION 1400 SIXTEENTH STREET, N. W. WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036 TEL (202) 939-7900 FAX (202) 745-0916

INTERNET www.fw-law.com

ORIGINAL

AARON I. FLEISCHMAN

FLEISCHMAN AND WALSH, P. C. FLEISCHMAN AND WALSH, P. C. CHARLES S. WALSH ARTHUR H. HARDING STUART F. FELDSTEIN JEFFRY L. HARDIN STEPHEN A. BOUCHARD R. BRUCE BECKNER CHRISTOPHER G. WOOD SETH A. DAVIDSON JAMES F. MORIARTY MATTHEW D. EMMER HOWARD A. TOPEL LOUIS H. DUPART* SHARON O'MALLEY MONAHAN** LAWRENCE R. FREEDMAN ERIC E. BREISACH*** DETAIL COMMISSION OF THE CONTINUE COMMISSION OF THE CONTINUE COMMISSION OF THE CONTINUE CONTI

JILL KLEPPE MCCLELLAND
REGINA FAMIGLIETTI PACE
CRAIG A. GILLEY
SUSAN A. MORT
MARK D. PIHLSTROM
BETH-SHERRI AKYEREKO
BRIIAN C. MALADY
THOMAS E. KNIGHT
SETH M. WARNER
MARK B. DENBO+
BRANDON H. HIRSCH
CARA E. SHEPPARD
STEVEN J. HAMRICK
KEVIN C. BRENNAN
FILOMENA D'ELIA
ARDEN T. PHILLIPS +

May 10, 2000

via Hand Delivery

Magalie Roman Salas, Secretary Office of The Secretary Office of Managing Director Federal Communications Commission 445 Twelfth Street, SW, TWA325 Washington, DC 20554

> Re: Ex Parte Presentation of Bachow/Coastel. L.L.C., WT Docket No. 97-112, CC Docket No. 90-6

Dear Ms. Salas:

Bachow/Coastel, L.L.C. ("Bachow/Coastel"), pursuant to section 1.1206(b)(2) of the Commission's rules, and by its attorneys, herewith files with the Commission an original and one copy of its summary of its ex parte presentation at the Commission on Tuesday, May 9, 2000, and the paper handout from that meeting. On that date, Bachow/Coastel Vice President of Operations, Robert Ivanoff, along with Bachow/Coastel's counsel, Steven J. Hamrick, Esq. of Fleischman and Walsh, L.L.P., met with Peter A. Tenhula, Senior Legal Advisor in the Office of Commissioner Michael K. Powell. Bachow/Coastel is filing two additional copies of this summary with the Commission due to the second docket number attached to this proceeding.

In this meeting, Bachow/Coastel stated that the primary reason for the Commission's proposed rules in its Second Further Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("Second FNPRM"), which is to provide reliable cellular service in the coastal areas of the Gulf of Mexico, 2 is no longer at

No. oi Copies rec'd_07 LISTABCDE

¹ 47 C.F.R. § 1.1206(b).

See Cellular Service and Other Commercial Mobile Radio Services in the Gulf of Mexico, 65 Fed. Reg. 24168-24169 (April 25, 2000).

Magalie Roman Salas May 10, 2000 Page -2-

issue, because licensees currently provide reliable cellular service in those geographic areas. The Gulf of Mexico, and most certainly the area proposed to be the Coastal Zone in the Second FNPRM's proposed rules, is covered by Bachow/Coastel's service contours. Bachow/Coastel also cited serious legal issues raised by the Second FNPRM's proposed rules, which do not address the mandate of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit's ("D.C. Circuit") decision in *Petroleum Communications, Inc. v. Federal Communications Commission*, 22 F.3d 1164 (D.C. Cir. 1994) ("*Petroleum*"), namely: that limiting Gulf licensees to areas of actual reliable service was arbitrary and capricious; to not apply the same licensing standards to both Gulf-based licensees and land-based licensees without explaining why the Commission would suddenly deviate from its longstanding policy of treating Gulf carriers differently than land-based carriers; and take into consideration the unique nature of operations for Gulf-based licensees. The adoption of the rules proposed in the Second FNPRM raises serious legal questions; indeed, a continuation of this rulemaking proceeding will likely lead to litigation.

Bachow/Coastel noted that the current Commission rules are effectively dealing with carrier problems in the Gulf of Mexico, and are spurring the expansion of coverage throughout the Gulf of Mexico. Bachow/Coastel also recounted how the presence of the Second FNPRM stymied negotiations with land-based licensees for extension agreements and settlement agreements. Finally, Bachow/Coastel raised the possibility of the Commission conducting its own fact-finding study to determine whether there are service reliability issues along the Gulf Coast, and the possibility that the Commission might form two industry working groups to provide recommendations to the Commission (one group would include licensees with Florida coast license areas, and the other group would deal with the remaining Gulf coastal areas).

If you have any questions concerning this filing, or if you require additional information, please do not hesitate to call.

Steven J. Hamrick

Cordially,

Counsel to Bachow/Coastel, L.L.C.

Attach.

Unserved Area Rulemaking for the

Gulf of Mexico

January 1993

Third Circuit Court of Appeals

May 1994

Decision

March 1997

Further Proposed Rulemaking

Further Proposed Rulemaking

April 2000

rulemaking has resolved itself over the past 7 The underlying premise for the proposed years.

- The public is our endly receiving reliable service in coastal areas
- The Gulf carriers have economic incentive to provide quality service in high traffic areas
- No benefit to warehouse spectrum
- Bachow/Coastel has doubled the number of cell sites in 3 years
- 3 A-band land based carriers have implemented land based co-location systems
- If there is no significant issue, why have rulemaking for rulemaking's sake?

- This is not an industry-wide issue
- There are only 12 carriers are the real parties of interest
- The Bureau has not attempted to negotiate or mediate a compromise in 7 years
- The current rules provide opportunities to address temporary service deficiencies
- STA (Special Temporary Authorizations)
- IOA (Interim Operating Authority)

- of the proposed relies do not address the count remand
- The proposed rules improperly modify the Gulf carriers licensed territory
- likely result in the same parties seeking An extended rulemaking processes will court intervention and is a waste of resources

ESINSEO) EDIMONITE SINSINI

- o There are no oilless platiforms off the Florida Coast...Presidential proclamation
- There are regulatory measures under existing rules which result in reliable coverage all along the Florida Coast
- de minimis Extensions
- Florida Coast only involves a total of 5 carriers

ders' issues, but <u>proposed eulemaking</u> does not

- Gull Carriers must confinmously deal with interference from land carriers
- Our experiences with GTE over interference expensive and exposed us to delaying and complaints has been time consuming, bullying tactics.
- platform (or a lease) it automatically is Effectively, if a Gulf Carrier loses a stripped of coverage area

Reconnenence (2 CTO)

- Groups to provide recommendations to the o Proprin axxo elificarent linduistry Working FCC
- Florida Coast
- Carriers with Florida Coast territory
- Remaining Gulf Coast Areas
- Initiate FCC staff fact-finding to determine whether there are cellular issues along the **Gulf** Coastline